REFERENCE TO MATTERS PUBLISHED BY NEWSPAPERS—SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Siddaveerappa raised in the House on 8th July 1967 that it was published in *Samyukta Karnataka* dated 8th July 1967 page 4, column 5 to the effect that a Congress member had said that " he may have to face the consequences " and he felt that this was a threat. The official proceedings do not contain any such Expression. The Official Reporter who reports verbatim can record only one speech at a time. Perhaps the alleged statement was made at a time when the Reporter was recording the speech of the hon'ble member who held the floor of the House. Since the statement does not find a place in the Official Report no further action need be taken in this matter. That is my suggestion subject to anything that might be said if there is anything very cogent to say.

Now another important matter that arises in this connection is whether the Press has published a matter which has not been recorded in the Official Proceedings. This is a bigger question and need not be taken up on this occasion, as the publication does not affect the member by way of any insinuation. But I would certainly like to appeal to all the hon'ble members to see that if they really want to be recorded or if anybody wants that anybody else's observation should be recorded, then there should be only one person talking at a time. How do you expect the Reporter to do the impossible ? If half-a-dozen members get up and talk simultaneously, what is still more if half-a-dozen talk and intervene standing and another half-a-dozen members intervene and make remarks sitting, and if all that is to be recorded, is it humanly possible to record more than one speech at a time ? This is a queer situation that arises primarily on account of the violation of the rules. When delicate situations like this arise, one interjection here or one correction there may be overlooked and when I do not find that in the Official record it becomes extremely delicate from the published report to see whether it was really uttered and if so what were the words uttered, what is the implication of the words uttered, and if any implication arises how it should be prevented or dealt with....

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I bow down to your suggestion, *viz.*, that as long as there is no official recording of what is alleged to have been said as reported in the Press, I need not pursue that matter further. But, if there is any hon'ble member on that side who says that he said so on that day and if he is prepared to repeat it, then only I shall be able to answer.

SRI S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelgola).—You were pleased to state that if two or three people speak at a time it will be difficult for the Official Reporters to record. I suggest that we may have a Tape Recorder so that everything will be on record. In West Bengal and some other places they have the Tape Recorder.

Mr. SPEAKER —It is a very important suggestion, which the Leader of the Opposition, after mature consideration has made. I will bestow still greater attention on it at a later date.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE *re:* CLOSURE OF M.S.K. MILLS, GULBARGA

Sri DIGAMBAR RAO BALWANT RAO (Aland).—Sir, I wish to call the attention of the Chief Minister regarding the 'Closure of M.S.K. Mills at Gulbarga' and consequent unemployment caused thereby, under Ruls 63.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—It may be stated that the Government of India have already appointed an Enquiry Committee on the M.S.K. Mills Company Ltd., Gulbarga to enquire into the problems faced by the Company. Government have carefully considered the Report of this Enquiry Committee and are of the opinion that the Mills do not have a case on economic grounds. The State Government have already extended financial assistance to the extent of Rs. 171.59 lakhs to the Mills Company and the first stage of rehabilitation involved a total outlay of Rs. 24.50 lakhs. The result of implementing this scheme of rehabilitation has not been encouraging. It has not contributed anything towards the improvement in the economic working and financial position of the Company.

The Mills Company has become an unsound financial proposition on account of heavy accumulated losses, worn out machinery and other problems like the abnormal rise in prices of cotton, imposition of statutory control over the cloth prices, devaluation of the rupee and consequent rise in the cost of production and of the rehabilitation, general crisis in the textile trade and the Bonus Act which added to the burden of the Company.

At present the Mills Company is incurring heavy losses and has to pay interest to the extent of more than rupees one lakh per month. To continue the Mills in the present state would mean a monthly loss of about Rs. 2.5 to 3 lakhs or about Rs. 30 lakhs loss per year or even more. At this rate it is feared that in the next two years, there will be a total loss of all investmement of Government.

The rehabilitation of the Mills Company, was also considered and it was seen that it would involve heavy investment from Government at the cost of other priority items of development and considerable and drastic means to reconstruct the existing company. Therefore, there appears to be no alternative to the decision to close the Mills Company as already resolved by the Board of Directors.